

Attorney Docket No.: 40146/20601 (968)

REMARKS**I. INTRODUCTION**

Claim 131 is currently amended. No new matter has been added. Claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, 13, 14, 18-20, 23-25, 28-30, 32, 33, 37, 38, 116 and 137-146 are allowed. Claims 131 and 133-136 stand rejected. Thus, claims 1, 4-6, 9-11, 13, 14, 18-20, 23-25, 28-30, 32, 33, 37, 38, 116, 131 and 133-146 remain pending in the present application. In view of the following remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the presently pending claims are allowable.

II. THE 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) REJECTION SHOULD BE WITHDRAWN

Claims 131 and 133-136 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,308,255 to Hudetz et al. ("Hudetz") in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,185,602 to Bayrakeri ("Bayrakeri"). (See 07/31/07 Office Action, p. 3, ¶ 4).

Currently amended claim 131 recites, *inter alia*, a "method, comprising receiving bar codes *from a plurality of bar code readers*, the bar codes selected by a group of users using the bar code readers *from a plurality of sources*;" (Emphasis added).

Hudetz generally relates to a system and method for using identification codes found on ordinary of commerce to access remote computers on a network. (See Hudetz, Abstract). According to Hudetz, the ordinary article of commerce may be used to access sites on the Internet. (See *Id.*, col. 4, lines 64-66; and Figs. 1 and 2). Specifically, Hudetz discloses a system that allows *a person* who desires Internet resources concerning a particular product to access those resources using the product's UPC symbol. (See *Id.*, col. 4, line 67 – col. 5, line 3; and Figs. 1 and 2). Furthermore, Hudetz discloses a method in which *a user* enters or scans a

Attorney Docket No.: 40146/20601 (968)

UPC symbol onto *a local host computer*. (See *Id.*, col. 8, lines 11-46; and Figs. 1 and 2).

Specifically, the user is defined as “*a human*” or “a program running on [the] *local host*”. (See *Id.*). Accordingly, it is clear that both the system and the method disclosed by Hudetz is directed at receiving UPC symbol information from a single user, or at least from a single scanner at a single source (i.e., host computer). Thus, the system and method disclosed by Hudetz simply provides the user with site information based on a UPC information inputted via the local computer. Hudetz fails to teach or suggest “a group of users using *the plurality* bar code readers from *a plurality of sources*.”

It is important to note that in the 07/31/07 Office Action, the Examiner addresses the recitation of a “group of users.” (See 07/31/07 Office Action, p. 3, ¶ 4). Specifically, the Examiner states that, according to Hudetz, “users of local host 28 and input device 44” teaches the claimed recitation of group of “users using bar code readers.” (See *Id.*). However, as noted by the Examiner, despite the number of “users” according to Hudetz, there is only a single host computer 28 and there is a single input device 44.” In contrast to the recitations of claim 131, the Hudetz disclosure is silent on *a group of users* using *a plurality bar code readers* from *a plurality of sources*. Since the aim of Hudetz is to provide a single user with product information based on the UPC information received from a single input device, Hudetz fails to teach or suggest a “method comprising receiving bar codes from a plurality of bar code readers, the bar codes selected by a group of users using the plurality bar code readers from a plurality of sources” and “allowing the group of users to connect to an Internet portal in response to receiving the bar codes...,” as recited in claim 131.

Bayrakeri generally relates to a process for multi-user interaction for multimedia communication. (See Bayrakeri, Abstract). The Examiner introduces the Bayrakeri disclosure

Attorney Docket No.: 40146/20601 (968)

to teach “multi-user interaction over the Internet through the use of chat rooms.” (See 07/31/07 Office Action, p. 4, ¶ 4). While the Applicants do not concede that Bayrakeri teaches any of the claimed limitations in claim 131, it is respectfully submitted that the Bayrakeri disclosure cited by the Examiner is insufficient to cure the above-stated deficiencies of Hudetz. Specifically, Bayrakeri fails to teach or suggest a “method comprising receiving bar codes from a plurality of bar code readers, the bar codes selected by a group of users using the plurality bar code readers from a plurality of sources” and “allowing the group of users to connect to an Internet portal in response to receiving the bar codes...,” as recited in claim 131.

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that for at least the reasons stated above, claim 131 of the present application is allowable over Hudetz in view of Bayrakeri, and request that the rejection of this claim be withdrawn. As claims 133-136 depend from, and therefore include all the limitations of claim 131, it is hereby submitted that these claims are also allowable.


Attorney Docket No.: 40146/20601 (968)

CONCLUSION

In light of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all of the now pending claims are in condition for allowance. All issues raised by the Examiner having been addressed. An early and favorable action on the merits is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: October 31, 2007



By: _____
Oleg F. Kaplun (Reg. No. 45,559)

Fay Kaplun & Marcin, LLP
150 Broadway, Suite 702
New York, NY 10038
Phone: 212-619-6000
Fax: 212-619-0276